

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, and 4 are pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 2, 5, and 6 have been canceled, and claims 1, 3, and 4 have been amended to further improve their form, readability, and clarity. Claim 1 further has been amended to incorporate claims 2 and 5, as well as to define that the first and second directional array speaker units generate sound fields having various phases intermixed with each other. See page 15, the first full paragraph. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Aylward (USP 5,809,153). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Aylward in view of Weinrich (USP 5,201,006).

In the previous reply, applicant defined an inversion circuit in one of the speaker units to overcome the art rejections. The examiner now relies on Aylward for the proposition that providing an inversion circuit 27a, 27b in a speaker unit is known, relying on the passage set forth in column 3, lines 12-22. The examiner relied upon Weinrich for the proposition that providing a delay circuit in Aylward would have been obvious.

First, neither Aylward nor Weinrich discloses any directional array speaker unit having a plurality of directional speakers arranged in an array, let alone having **each speaker** of the directional array speaker unit emit sound toward a wall surface or sound reflection board. Indeed, Aylward merely discloses a speaker unit containing multiple speakers all directed to different directions. The speakers in the speaker unit are not arranged in an array. Thus, the speaker unit is not an array speaker unit. Moreover, not each of the speakers in the speaker unit is directed to a wall surface or sound reflection board. Applicant thus submits that Aylward would not have anticipated claim 1.

Second, even if Weinrich were properly combinable with Aylward for argument's sake, Weinrich would merely have taught applying a delay to the sound signal to control feedback. Applicant submits that the combination would not have taught adjusting the delay (in the second directional array speaker unit) applied to the sound signal based on the amount of delay applied to the sound signal in the first directional array speaker unit so that the second sound directly

arrives at the prescribed listening position at the same time as the audio element of the first sound directly reaching the prescribed listening position, as now set forth in claim 1.

Third, claim 1 now calls for the first and second directional array speaker units to generate sound fields having various phases intermixed with each other. Array speakers form sound fields in which sounds of various phases intermix with each other to create more listenable sound, even when inverse phase sound is used to cancel unwanted sound. See page 15, the first full paragraph. In the speaker system of the type, such as disclosed in Aylward, sound cancelation effected via inverse phase sound can sound less desirable due to the speakers not generating sound fields in which sounds of various phases intermix with each other.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, and 4 clearly define over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

09 OCTOBER 2008

DATE

Lyle Kimms 100908/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. No. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)